REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 9-12, and 17-31 are currently pending and will remain pending in this application after the entry of this Response. Claims 1, 17, 23, 24, and 26 are currently amended.

Support for the amendments is found throughout the specification and claims as originally filed. For example, support for the amendments to claims 1, 17, 23, 24, and 26 is found in ¶ [0038] of the specification as originally filed. No new matter is added.

Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's consideration of the reference(s) cited in the Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement concurrently submitted.

35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-7, 17-21, and 23-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1 for failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicant disagrees and respectfully traverses this rejection.

With regard to claims 1, 17, 23, 24, and 26, Applicant respectfully asserts that ¶ [0038] of the specification provides an enabling disclosure for "allowing the user to delay the instantiation" of an application state file and "allowing the user [...] to manipulate a first aspect of the design before loading."

Paragraph [0038] states:

> When an application state file 52 is received, session clients 42 send a session control 66 to the local user application 30 indicating that a new application state file is available. The local user application 30 loads the newly arrived application state file 52 using parser 80 to reflect a new state of the display. *Using local session client UI 60, the user can control when the synchronization actually occurs and how long it is in effect, without affecting active connectivity with the collaborative session. While the session client 42 continuously buffers application states files 52 from the other participants, for example, users may refuse or delay instantiation of the newly arrived application state file 52 in their user application 30.* This on-demand synchronization allows the user to work on something independently with the

> user application 30 while the collaboration continues and then catch up later without loosing the details of the concurrent collaborative exchange.

Specification ¶ [0038] (emphasis added). Paragraph [0038] enables one of skill in the art by describing a set of elements, namely a UI (user interface) 60 for receiving input from a user and a session client 42 capable of buffering application state files 52, sufficient for implementing the claimed invention.

One of skill in the art at the time of the filing of the patent application would have been capable of implementing the claimed invention based on this disclosure and the knowledge inherent in one of skill in the art.

For example, a variety of programming languages such as MICROSOFT® VISUAL BASIC® and JAVA® allowed software programmers to quickly produce graphical user interfaces (GUIs) capable of receiving instructions from users. See, e.g., 1 Patrick Chan, The Java Developers ALMANAC 1.4: Examples & Quick Reference (2002); Michael Halvorson, Microsoft Visual Basic 6.0 Professional: Step by Step (1998).

Likewise, one of skill in the art would have been capable of implementing a session client capable of buffering application state files. See, e.g., Steven M. Kaplan, Wiley Electrical & Electronics Engineering Dictionary 84 (2004) (defining a buffer as a "segment of computer memory utilized to temporarily store information that awaits transfer or processing"); Andrew S. Tanenbaum, Modern Operating Systems 294-97 (2d ed. 2001) (discussing application of buffering to operating systems).

With regard to claim 30, Applicant respectfully asserts that the disclosure cited above would enable one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of filing this application to implement a method including the step of "allowing the user to refuse the instantiation of the at least one application state file created by other local applications."

Although Applicant disagrees with the rejection, Applicant currently amends claims 1, 17, 23, 24, and 26 to recite "buffering the at least one application state file to allow the user to delay the instantiation of the at least one application state file" to promote expeditious prosecution of this application.

Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of 1-7, 17-21, and 23-31 under the 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1 enablement requirement.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-7, 9-12, and 17-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,567,783 to Notani et al. (hereinafter "Notani") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,928,396 to Thackston (hereinafter "Thackston"). Applicant respectfully disagrees and requests reconsideration in light of the amendments and remarks herein.

Claims 1-7, 9, 10, 17-21, 23, 30, and 31

Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 1-7, 9, 10, 17-21, 23, 30, and 31 are not obvious in light of Notani and Thackston because neither Notani nor Thackston teach or suggest presenting other application state files from other clients to a user and allowing the user to delay the instantiation of the other application state files until a time determined by the user, as currently claimed.

Independent claims 1, 17, 23, 24, and 26 recite presenting other application state files from other clients to a user and allowing the user to delay the instantiation of the other application state files. The Office Action acknowledges at page 5 that Notani does not disclose either of these features, but asserts that:

> It would have been obvious for one [of] skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement such time non-dependency so that the client in Notani can have flexibility in time whereby to decide when to use the latest received versions of a portion of communication workflow data or object via used of Event Manager, Workflow manager and message collaborative in Notani's Hub and Spoke system.

Applicant respectfully asserts that it would not have been obvious to modify Notani as proposed by the Office Action because designs representing electrical or mechanical assemblies as addressed by the claimed invention present fundamentally different concerns than the workflows addressed by Notani. Specifically, Notani seeks to reach an "optimal" answer based on a workflow and a decision. Notani, col. 2, lines 1-29. This "optimal" answer is determined by one or more engines. Id. Accordingly, instantaneous change propagation would have minimal, if any, effect on the engines computing the "optimal" answer.

In contrast, the pre-mature implementation of another user's changes in a design program for electrical or mechanical assemblies can be extremely disruptive.

In order for the claimed invention to be obvious, a person of ordinary skill in the art would need to make at least two logical steps. First, the person of ordinary skill in the art would need to recognize that the workflow program of Notani could be combined with the engineering development system of Thackston. Second, the person of ordinary skill in the art would need to recognize the benefit of allowing a user to delay in the implementation of changes.

Applicants respectfully submit that the implicit assertion that a person having skill in the art would make not one, but both of these logical leaps goes beyond permissible means for proving obviousness and engages in impermissible use of hindsight gleaned from Applicant's disclosure.

Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-7, 9, 10, 17-21, 23, 30, and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claims 11, 12, and 22

Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 11, 12, and 22 are not obvious in light of Notani and Thackston because neither Notani nor Thackston teach or suggest providing asynchronous training to a user by transmitting a journal file containing at least one application state file and interactive instructions.

Neither Notani or Thackston discuss educational features of their respective inventions. While Thackston's software can store information regarding a user's certifications, neither Thackston nor Notani teach or a suggest systems or methods for providing interactive instructions for manipulating electrical or mechanical assemblies as claimed.

Moreover, neither the cited figures nor language on page 9 of the Office Action teach or suggest providing asynchronous training.[1]

Applicant's claimed invention provides a significant and non-obvious advantage over prior art systems such as those discussed in Notani and Thackston. Computer-aided

[1] The Office Action at page 9 states, "Note: integration of workflow information into a user application or Activity reads on *interaction when playback* – see Fig. 16-19; and *asynchronous* training because the asynchronous availability of message or application state journal is events by nature of communication protocol and event manager – see Fig. 13-14."

design (CAD) systems are complex systems that require significant training before a user becomes truly proficient. Applicant's claimed invention provides for the asynchronous training of users without the need for a live presentation, thereby reducing costs and allowing greater flexibility.

Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 11, 12, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Applicant believes that no fees or extensions are required other than fee for an Information Disclosure Statement under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(p). However, if for any reason the authorized fee is inadequate, the Office is conditionally authorized and requested to charge Deposit Account No. **04-1105** under order number 2012(220768). Also, the Office should consider this a conditional petition for the proper extension period needed to have this response entered and considered, if any.

Dated: July 31, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Brian R. Landry/
Brian R. Landry
Registration No.: 62,074
Ralph A. Loren
Registration No.: 29,325
EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE LLP
P.O. Box 55874
Boston, Massachusetts 02205
(617) 239-0100
Attorneys For Applicant

Customer No.: 21874